# U.S. Department of Education 2012 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

A Public School - 12NH2

| School Type (Public Schools):                                    |                 |                 |                 |  |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| (Check all that apply, if any)                                   | Charter         | Title 1         | Magnet          | Choice   |
| Name of Principal: Mr. Stephe                                    | en Sexton       |                 |                 |  |
| Official School Name: <u>Lisbor</u>                              | n Regional Sch  | nool (Middle)   |                 |  |
| School Mailing Address:  | 25 Highland A   | <u> venue</u>   |                 |  |
|  | Lisbon, NH 03   | 3585-6112       |                 |  |
| County: <u>Grafton</u>   | State School (  | Code Number*    | : <u>23095</u>  |  |
| Telephone: (603) 838-6672  | E-mail: ssext   | on@lisbon.k1    | 2.nh.us         |  |
| Fax: (603) 838-5012  | Web site/URL    | : http://www    | .lisbon.k.12.n  | <u>h.us/</u>   |
| I have reviewed the informatio - Eligibility Certification), and |                 |                 |                 | ity requirements on page 2 (Part I ll information is accurate. |
|  |                 |                 |                 | Date   |
| (Principal's Signature)  |                 |                 |                 |  |
| Name of Superintendent*: Mr.                                     | Paul MacMill    | an Superinte    | endent e-mail:  | p.macmillan@sau35.org  |
| District Name: Lisbon Regiona                                    | al School Distr | rict District P | Phone: (603) 4  | <u>44-3925</u>   |
| I have reviewed the informatio - Eligibility Certification), and |                 |                 |                 | ity requirements on page 2 (Part I is accurate.                |
|  |                 |                 |                 | Date   |
| (Superintendent's Signature)                                     |                 |                 |                 |  |
| Name of School Board Preside                                     | nt/Chairperso   | n: Mr. Stepher  | <u>Morrison</u> |  |
| I have reviewed the informatio - Eligibility Certification), and |                 |                 |                 | ity requirements on page 2 (Part I is accurate.                |
|  |                 |                 | ·               | Date   |
| (School Board President's/Cha                                    | irperson's Sig  | nature)         |                 |  |

The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Blue Ribbon Schools Project Manager (aba.kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

<sup>\*</sup>Non-Public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

- 1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
- 2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.
- 3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2011-2012 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
- 4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take foreign language courses.
- 5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2006.
- 6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 or 2011.
- 7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
- 8. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
- 9. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
- 10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

### All data are the most recent year available.

### **DISTRICT**

| 1. Number of schools in the district | 1     | Elementary schools (includes K-8) |
|--------------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|
| (per district designation):          | 1     | Middle/Junior high schools        |
|                                      | 1     | High schools                      |
|                                      | 0     | K-12 schools                      |
|                                      | 3     | Total schools in district         |
| 2. District per-pupil expenditure:   | 10940 |                                   |
|                                      |       |                                   |

**SCHOOL** (To be completed by all schools)

- 3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located: Rural
- 4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school: \_\_\_\_\_5
- 5. Number of students as of October 1, 2011 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade                     | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |  |    | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|---------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|--|----|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK                      | 0          | 0            | 0           |  | 6  | 16         | 13           | 29          |
| K                         | 0          | 0            | 0           |  | 7  | 12         | 22           | 34          |
| 1                         | 0          | 0            | 0           |  | 8  | 15         | 23           | 38          |
| 2                         | 0          | 0            | 0           |  | 9  | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 3                         | 0          | 0            | 0           |  | 10 | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 4                         | 0          | 0            | 0           |  | 11 | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 5                         | 0          | 0            | 0           |  | 12 | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| Total in Applying School: |            |              |             |  |    | 101        |              |             |

| 6. Racial/ethnic com   | position of the school:  | 1 %                     | American                       | India                     | an or Alaska Native          |  |
|--|--|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|
|  | _  | 3 %                     | 3 % Asian                      |                           |                              |  |
|  |  | 0 %                     | Black or A                     | Africa                    | an American                  |  |
|  |  | 0 %                     | Hispanic                       | or La                     | tino                         |  |
|  |  | 0 %                     | Native Ha                      | awaiia                    | an or Other Pacific Islander |  |
|  |  | 96 %                    | White                          |                           |                              |  |
|  |  | 0 %                     | Two or m                       | ore r                     | aces                         |  |
|  |  | 100 %                   | Total                          |                           |                              |  |
| school. The final Gu<br>Department of Educ<br>each of the seven ca<br>7. Student turnover, | nidance on Maintaining,<br>eation published in the C                           | Collectin<br>October 19 | g, and Rej<br>, 2007 <i>Fe</i> | portir<br>deral<br>ool ye |                              |  |
| (1)  | Number of students w<br>the school after Octob<br>the end of the school y      | er 1, 2010              |                                | 5                         |                              |  |
| (2)  | Number of students w <i>from</i> the school after ountil the end of the school | October 1,              |                                | 3                         |                              |  |
| (3)  | Total of all transferred rows (1) and (2)].                                    | l students              | [sum of                        | 8                         |                              |  |

101

0.08

8

0%

0

(4) Total number of students in the school

(5) Total transferred students in row (3)

divided by total students in row (4).

(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.

as of October 1, 2010

8. Percent of English Language Learners in the school:

Total number of ELL students in the school:

Specify non-English languages:

Number of non-English languages represented:

| 9. Percent of students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: | 42% |
|--|-----|
| Total number of students who qualify:                          | 42  |

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

| 10. Percent of students receiving special education services: | 13% |
|---|-----|
| Total number of students served:                              | 13  |

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

| 0 Autism                | 0 Orthopedic Impairment                 |
|-------------------------|---|
| 0 Deafness              | 4 Other Health Impaired                 |
| 0 Deaf-Blindness        | 6 Specific Learning Disability          |
| 1 Emotional Disturbance | 1 Speech or Language Impairment         |
| 0 Hearing Impairment    | 0 Traumatic Brain Injury                |
| 1 Mental Retardation    | 0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| 0 Multiple Disabilities | 0 Developmentally Delayed               |

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

Number of Staff

|  | <b>Full-Time</b> | Part-Time |
|--|------------------|-----------|
| Administrator(s)   | 0                | 1         |
| Classroom teachers   | 5                | 4         |
| Resource teachers/specialists (e.g., reading specialist, media specialist, art/music, PE teachers, etc.) | 0                | 6         |
| Paraprofessionals  | 2                | 1         |
| Support staff (e.g., school secretaries, custodians, cafeteria aides, etc.)                              | 0                | 10        |
| Total number   | 7                | 22        |

| 12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the nur | nber of students in the school |
|--|--------------------------------|
| divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g       | ., 22:1:                       |

17:1

13. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

|                             | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance    | 96%       | 95%       | 95%       | 96%       | 95%       |
| High school graduation rate | %         | %         | %         | %         | %         |

| 14  | For | schools | ending in | grade 12 | (high | schools): |
|-----|-----|---------|-----------|----------|-------|-----------|
| ıŦ. | LUI | SCHOOLS | chume m   | graut 12 | (mgn  | SCHOOLS). |

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2011 are doing as of Fall 2011.

| Graduating class size:                     |                |
|--|----------------|
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university | %              |
| Enrolled in a community college            | <del></del> %  |
| Enrolled in vocational training            | <del></del> %  |
| Found employment                           | <del></del> %  |
| Military service                           | <del></del> %  |
| Other                                      | <del></del> %  |
| Total                                      | <del></del> 0% |

| 15. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools aw | vard |
|--|------|
|--|------|

| 0 | No  |
|---|-----|
| 0 | Vac |

If yes, what was the year of the award?

Lisbon Regional Middle School (LRMS) is a small, rural school located in the White Mountains of Northern New Hampshire. This is one of our strengths. Our small size and total K-12 configuration promote a family atmosphere in which everyone supports one another, providing the staff the opportunity for a great deal of vertical articulation. Teachers have the opportunity to align curriculum throughout grades K-12 to provide a smooth transition for our students as they move through our system. Our size also enables us to personalize learning. Students do not fall between the cracks; we know our children and closely track their behaviors and grades. We hold intervention team meetings weekly and parent meetings whenever any individual student's grades fall or behavior is questionable. Our efforts provide us the ability to match appropriate interventions with any deficiencies. The expected result is reducing or eliminating the gap between the entire population and our subgroups of students. One accomplishment about which we are most excited is how successful we have been at moving our students out of the lowest level on the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP). This upward movement adds to our already impressive percentage of students performing at the proficient level or above on the NECAPs.

The small community in which we live has historically supported our school. The school is the focal point of the town. When the school has an event, everyone attends. Lisbon's tax rate is one of the highest in the state while its economic status is one of the poorest. Even so, when children are involved, the taxpayers never hold back, and they are an integral part of who we are. The main industry in town, New England Electric Wire Technologies Inc. supports our school and our students. Many projects have benefited from this partnership. We are in a low socioeconomic area of the state and times are tough for everyone, but the welfare of the youth in our area has always been a priority and continues to be so.

The educational philosophy at LRMS evolved from our belief that our children are our most important asset, and as such, their abilities, attitudes, and loyalties are our responsibility. The school must be prepared to educate a variety of individuals to their maximum benefit for themselves, their community, their state, and their nation.

The primary goal at LRMS is to provide an environment conducive to the development of well adjusted individuals who possess healthy attitudes toward learning. Our educational philosophy must center around and focus upon the individual, his/her learning process, and his/her relationship and interaction with other students and teachers.

It is our duty to accept each student as a person. His/her feelings and ideas deserve consideration. We must allow and encourage each student to work at his/her own rate and to develop his/her own unique style of learning. Emphasis should be placed upon learning rather than teaching.

LRMS provides a flexible and diverse program where all students may achieve success. We strive to make the learning process relevant to all students by tapping into prior student experiences. We encourage students to develop a sense of responsibility.

The teachers as professionals should be leaders, role-models, and guides. The primary goal of the teachers and school is the growth of students as knowledgeable citizens.

The mission of Lisbon Regional Middle School is to prepare students to become lifelong learners who strive for excellence, respect themselves and others, contribute to their community, and appreciate the beauty and diversity of our changing world. Inherent in this educational program is the concern for the physical, social, and emotional well-being of every student.

We, at Lisbon Regional Middle School, believe that in an ever-changing society, all members of the school community: Possess individual worth and need to treat themselves and others with respect and dignity; learn in a safe, positive, and nurturing environment; possess creative potential; have the potential to learn; learn best with a strong home/community/school partnership; and can become life-long learners.

Our vision is to produce students who: have a broad base of essential knowledge; are committed to lifelong learning; have an internal model of quality work; have a collaborative work ethic; possess a healthy sense of mind and body; communicate effectively; make wise, informed decisions; understand and appreciate diversity; participate as responsible citizens; and possess competencies and skills to master various bodies of knowledge in order to reason at complex levels and be effective problem solvers.

Our view of what it takes to be a Blue Ribbon School is one where the learning of every student is paramount in the everyday workings of the school, where every student is valued, and the overall achievement and success of every student is critical in what the staff does. Nothing gets in the way of helping all children develop both academic and social skills. We believe that our school exemplifies these traits, and over the past five years, has lived and honored the spirit of success for all. In our view, LRMS demonstrates what a Blue Ribbon School is. We have seen exceptional improvement in our students; their reading achievement has been exceptional and continues to be remarkable. Percentages do not always represent clearly a school like ours, which is so small. To put it in perspective, on this year's NECAP results, we have a total of only nine students who did not score proficient or above in reading. Of these nine students, only two scored substantially below proficient. These results are remarkable and deserving of Blue Ribbon recognition.

#### 1. Assessment Results:

The standardized assessment used at Lisbon Regional Middle School is the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP). The NECAP has four levels of proficiency: Level 4, Proficient with Distinction; Level 3, Proficient; Level 2, Partially Proficient; and Level 1, Substantially below Proficient. Our goal is to have all students performing at or above the Proficient level.

### **Analysis of Trends in Mathematics:**

In sixth grade, there has been a steady increase in the percentage of students scoring at or above the proficient level. In 2006, 54% of our students were at these levels, and in 2010, 88% of our students were at these levels. Almost half of the 88% scored proficient with distinction. Our seventh grade has also been steadily increasing over the course of these years with the exception of 2009, which saw a decrease of 6%. This decrease was made up the following year. The seventh grade began in 2006 with 50% scoring at or above the proficient level, and in 2010 were up to 77%. The trend with our eighth grade has been less consistent, but overall, they have gone from 44% being at or above the proficient level to 71%. These trends are also seen in our subgroup populations, with dramatic increases in our special education population. In the most recent year's data, 86% of our sixth grade special education students were proficient or above, increasing from 18% in 2006. 100% of our seventh grade population is at or above proficient, up from 25% in 2006. The trends of our socioeconomic disadvantaged students follow those of our general population.

In the most recent year's data in mathematics, there is no gap of more than 10 percentage points between the test scores of all students and the test scores of subgroups in sixth and seventh grade. Furthermore, our eighth grade socioeconomic disadvantaged students had a gap of fewer than 10 percentage points. Our eighth grade special education subgroup is the only group with a gap of more than 10 percentage points. This subgroup must be examined closely, however, since this group contains only four students. When dealing with groups this small, the performance of just one student can greatly skew the results.

#### **Analysis of Trends in Reading:**

We have seen similar positive trends in our students' reading assessment scores. Our sixth, seventh, and eighth grades have all shown significant increases in the percentage of students scoring at or above the proficient level over the past five year period. Our sixth grade went from 63% scoring proficient or above in 2006 to 88% in 2010. The special education subgroup increased from only 18% scoring proficient or higher to 72%. Our seventh grade had an even greater increase, moving from 56% proficient or above to 86%. The special education subgroup had 0% proficient or above in 2006, and this group increased to 50% in 2010. The eighth grade class increased more than the sixth and seventh grades. They moved from 60% at or above proficient in 2006 to 91% in 2010. The special education subgroup also saw tremendous gains from 25% scoring at or above proficient in 2006 to 75% in 2010. The trends of our socioeconomic disadvantaged students follow those of our general population.

In the most recent year's data in reading, there is a gap of more than 10 percentage points between the test scores of all students and the test scores of the special education subgroup in sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. However, there has been a significant decrease in the gap over the past five years. In sixth grade the gap has decreased 29 percentage points, in seventh grade 20 points, and in eighth grade 19 points.

In order to close the achievement gap in both mathematics and reading, we have increased our reliance on assessment data over the past five years. We have embraced the Response to Intervention (RTI) model

and provide small group instruction in both reading and mathematics. We make a conscious effort to review data and adjust our groupings for interventions on a regular basis.

#### **Conclusions:**

Although we have not closed all gaps between our total student population and our subgroups to fewer than 10 percentage points, we are extremely proud of the progress we have made thus far. In our socioeconomic disadvantaged subgroup, we only have one grade in reading, and none in mathematics, that has a gap of more than 10 percentage points.

In our special education subgroup, the trend over the past five years is a closing of the gap. Most rewarding is the fact that we have dramatically reduced the number of those students scoring at level 1, substantially below proficient. In 2006, we had a total of thirteen (68%) middle school special education students scoring substantially below proficient in mathematics. This decreased to two (13%) students in 2010. Similarly, in 2006 we had a total of seven (37%) middle school special education students scoring substantially below proficient in reading. This decreased to one (7%) student in 2010. Our socioeconomic disadvantaged subgroup reveals similar decreases in students scoring significantly below proficient.

### 2. Using Assessment Results:

Lisbon Regional Middle School uses assessment data to analyze and improve student and school performance in a variety of ways. The results of the NECAP are used by teachers to identify curriculum gaps. For instance, one year we determined that there were some weaknesses overall in our students' performance in geometry. Through curriculum adjustments, we were able to successfully target those particular skills. We have also found gaps in the reading and writing instruction that we have targeted in a similar manner. NECAP results are also used by special education personnel to identify present levels of performance when writing Individual Education Plans (IEPs) and to set goals for improving student achievement. Additionally, we use these results to identify students who are not achieving at a proficient level. These students are placed in small groups for supplemental instruction in those areas.

All middle school classes utilize the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment tool to monitor student growth and adjust curriculum and goals. Students are assessed three times per year in reading, language, and mathematics. Results of these assessments are used to write goals for IEPs, to obtain Lexile Levels for reading instruction, and to identify students who need additional supports to improve academically. Teachers use the results of NWEA assessments to identify gaps in instruction and gear lessons accordingly.

STAR Math is another assessment tool utilized to identify student achievement levels in mathematics. Results are used to determine which students need additional support in math. It is also used to monitor progress during the course of the year. Progress is monitored at least three times a year, and the data is discussed at team meetings and used to adjust intervention services.

Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy (DIBEL) is another assessment tool used to determine and monitor student reading progress. It is used to form groups of students needing additional supports in reading and writing. Grade level teams meet to discuss data and adjust grouping at least three times per year. There is ongoing, monthly testing which allows for fluid groupings.

Lisbon Regional Middle School informs parents, students, and the community of students' academic achievement in a multitude of ways. We currently utilize a program through Edline called GradeQuick. Using this program, teachers post students' grades online. This allows students and parents to check students' grades at any time. Students also receive printed progress reports half way through each quarter. A list of students achieving the Honor Roll is published in local newspapers at the end of each quarter, and there is an Honor Roll Assembly to which parents are invited. At this assembly,

students receive certificates acknowledging their achievement, and those earning Principal's List, along with their families, are invited to a short reception following the assembly.

Each time students take the NWEA assessment, they are told their previous score, given a goal to meet, and are told immediately after testing if they met their goal. At the end of each year, the NWEA results are sent home to parents along with students' report cards. The results are also discussed with parents and team members during IEP meetings and progress meetings.

The results of NECAP testing are sent home to parents, and again, are discussed during IEP meetings and students' progress meetings. These results are shared with the community in March during the annual school meeting, and the results are published in local newspapers.

### 3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

Lisbon Regional Middle School has shared successful strategies with other schools in our district, state, and professional associations. We are fortunate that our core middle school teachers share common planning time. This allows us to constantly communicate and provide feedback on what strategies are being used effectively with students. Being able to have this frequent dialogue with one another has been extremely helpful.

We also share our strategies by participating in subject alike meetings with other schools in our Supervisory Union. For the past several years, we have had the opportunity to meet yearly with teachers from these schools who teach the same grade level and/or subject area. These meetings are beneficial in that we have the opportunity to discuss with each other what instructional strategies are being used successfully. Other topics have included but are not limited to the following: how schools are aligning their curriculum with the Common Core State Standards and competencies; how schools are increasing student motivation in class and during testing; and how staff development could be used to increase student achievement.

We have a number of people from various schools who come to observe and meet with us to discuss how we are currently addressing the State Standards and are improving students' NECAP achievement. We share specific programs we are using such as STAR math, Accelerated math, and various intervention strategies. We also discuss scheduling and how we motivate students for the NECAP.

In January of 2010, several middle school teachers had the opportunity to present at the New Hampshire Teachers of Mathematics (NHTM) conference in Bedford, New Hampshire. They presented at a workshop entitled *Integrating Technology in K-8 Mathematics*. Teachers shared the various ways we have successfully integrated technology in order to improve student achievement. Topics included but were not limited to utilization of SMART Boards, use of CD-Rom's that accompany our mathematics program, and use of calculators available online.

Two years ago, we participated in Focused Monitoring through the State Department of Education. We were selected for participation due to our large gaps in achievement between overall school population and our special education population. We had already begun to decrease these gaps on our own, but we were able to make greater strides by utilizing their resources. At the end of the year, we developed a plan of improvement which was posted on the Department of Education's website for other schools to access.

### 4. Engaging Families and Communities:

Lisbon Regional Middle School has employed several strategies in working with family and community members for student success. One strategy we have found successful is increasing our use of technology to keep parents informed of what is happening in school. One way we do this is by utilizing websites, <u>Lisbon Regional Middle School</u> and <u>Lisbon Regional 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Grades</u>, where middle school teachers

post assignments, important dates, links to homework help, lists of recommended reading, and copies of project requirements and rubrics. This allows parents to keep current with what is occurring in classes, and it allows students to check on their classes as well.

The use of Edline's Grade Quick program is also successful. Teachers post students' grades at least weekly, and many parents access the program on a regular basis to check their students' grades and to see if students are current in their assignments. Through the use of the program, parents are able to get instant access to their children's progress.

The use of email and voicemail systems has been successful in working with families. Email facilitates communication between parents and teachers, and several parents are in frequent touch with teachers. It provides a quick, efficient way for teachers to let parents know about homework issues, behavior issues, or any other concerns. Voicemail is also convenient because a parent can easily leave a message for a teacher.

A Honeywell Instant Alert System was put into place several years ago to facilitate communication. This system allows us to easily send messages to our entire faculty, student body, and parents. It enables us to conveniently send reminders to parents of important dates such as open house or parent teacher conferences and remind them when progress reports should be arriving home.

Our "open door" policy is instrumental in working with families. Parents are welcome in the building and are often able to simply "drop in" to see a teacher after checking in at the office. We feel this encourages parents to remain involved in their students' education. We invite them in to celebrate their students' achievements, to be a part of project display days, and plays/performances. The middle school has designed multi-age, interdisciplinary units that have a culminating activity which parents and community members can attend.

One of the most successful strategies we have employed over the years is our Steering Committee. The Steering Committee consists of members of the faculty, school board, parents, and community members. The purpose of the Steering Committee is to provide direction for the entire school in regards to what we should be doing school wide to ensure the best possible education for our students. A number of initiatives have begun with the committee including our performance based graduation requirements, requiring online classes for high school students, competency based grading, and currently, our 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning work. Although many of these initiatives have been implemented at the high school level, it directly impacts the middle school as we need to prepare our students to become part of these initiatives. Some of these have required us to use more technology, teach research skills, and include more public speaking opportunities within our classrooms. All middle school classes are currently using competency based grading as well.

#### 1. Curriculum:

The core curriculum at Lisbon Regional Middle School was developed by teachers in common subject areas and is aligned with both the New Hampshire State Frameworks and the Common Core State Standards. From this curriculum, a set of competencies has been developed for each grade level and subject area. These competencies are those we feel are the essential skills and knowledge students need to be proficient, and they are designed to be rigorous. Instruction is geared to these competencies, and students are assessed through both formative and summative assignments. The curriculum and competencies have been developed and are implemented with the goal of reaching our mission of having all students become lifelong learners who strive for excellence.

**English Language Arts**: At the heart of the middle school English language arts program is the desire to foster a love of reading within students, for them to develop the habit of reading for a variety of purposes, and to make personal connections to literature. Essential to meeting this goal is the option of student choice in reading and writing assignments. For further description of our language arts program, see part V, item 2.

**Mathematics**: The 6<sup>th</sup> grade uses Everyday Math, a demanding program that addresses all of our math competencies in a spiraling manner. The 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades use Connected Math. Connected Math is unique as it is designed around problem solving while incorporating important related concepts. Both programs are designed to challenge and motivate each student to reach his/her fullest potential. For further description of our math program, see part V, item 3.

**Science**: Inquiry and hands-on discovery are the backbone of our student centered science instruction. Differentiating our instruction provides opportunities for all students to be challenged as well as allowing students to learn and demonstrate knowledge through a multitude of different avenues. The competencies for sixth grade are balanced between the three disciplines of general science: life, physical and Earth/space. Seventh and eighth grades follow the state's outline of life and Earth/space science. Physical science is interwoven throughout by linking it with appropriate life and Earth/space science concepts. Throughout all grades, we attempt to foster positive attitudes and enthusiasm, and in this way, we encourage students to pursue further studies in science.

**Social Studies**: In our social studies curriculum, our overall theme is global awareness. Our 6th grade explores ancient cultures; the 7<sup>th</sup> grade examines world geography and cultures; the 8<sup>th</sup> grade focuses on the study of United States history. All grades incorporate a study of contemporary issues into the curriculum. For further description of our social studies curriculum, see part V, item 4.

**Art:** The middle school visual arts program seeks to give students a solid understanding of the elements and principles of art and design while exploring a variety of media including ceramics, drawing, painting, sculpture, and printmaking with art history woven throughout. The understanding, appreciation, and lifelong enjoyment of the visual arts are core values of the program. Extension opportunities are provided with an after school art club.

**Music**: Each year of middle school, students participate in general music. They have the opportunity to collaborate with high school students in the yearly musical production and winter and spring concerts which showcase their musical aptitude. Students in middle school are encouraged to take instrumental lessons and perform in the school band, and during the winter months, students share their talents with the community by playing in the pep band at high school basketball games. Select students are also invited to

participate in high school acappella groups, and these groups perform for a variety of community organizations.

Physical Education, Health, and Nutrition: Student wellness is addressed through our physical education, health, and family and consumer science courses. Students are enrolled in these courses each year of their middle school experience and participate in daily activities to learn the importance of a healthy, active lifestyle. Examples of activities are snowshoeing, yoga, cycling, and a variety of team sports. Health and nutrition classes focus on developing healthy eating habits, knowledge of proper nutrition, and the importance of physical fitness. The knowledge gained in health classes is applied in family and consumer science classes through the creation and preparation of healthy meals and snacks. In addition, in all these courses, emphasis is placed on making informed choices impacting students' lifelong physical and mental well-being.

**Technology**: All middle school students receive technology education each year. The goal is to connect instruction to 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills through projects that encourage collaboration, creativity, innovation, and media literacy. Web 2.0 is emphasized as these tools will assist them throughout their educational years and into their futures, regardless of their career choices. A variety of technology is at our disposal such as digital cameras, video cameras, and green screens. We utilize programs such as *Audacity* and *Voice Thread*. We offer a photography club and a video club. We have students participate each year in the North Country Middle School Film Festival where they create a public service announcement. We have been fortunate to have several groups nominated for awards, and we have had some winners.

**World Language**: In grade eight, students complete a year-long study of world languages, focusing on French and Spanish. The goal of this program is to develop an awareness and appreciation of foreign cultures and to have students develop an interest in continuing language studies throughout their high school and future careers.

### 2. Reading/English:

The English language arts (ELA) curriculum is aligned with the New Hampshire State Frameworks and the Common Core State Standards. Essential competencies have been developed for each grade level. ELA teachers offer a multitude of learning experiences through various teaching methods in the areas of reading, writing, speaking and listening, and language.

Students at Lisbon Regional Middle School are excited about reading. They can often be heard discussing literature in the hallways in the mornings, with one another waiting for classes to begin, and with various teachers across all disciplines. They often recommend books to one another and to staff. These positive attitudes in reading are in part developed by ELA teachers allowing ample student choice with high interest middle school literature collections. We are fortunate to have an enthusiastic library media specialist who works diligently to obtain the funding necessary to purchase multiple copies of books representing a variety of genres that have been recommended by librarians and students throughout the state. Students are so enthusiastic about these collections that they have donated money from their own fundraising to help obtain them. Both group reading activities such as literature circles and individual reading work continue to elicit reading growth.

Students are exposed to and work with various forms of written expression. Making connections between reading and writing is emphasized, as is making personal connections to literature. For five years now, students have participated in the nationwide Letters about Literature contest where they are asked to write to an author and explain how his/her work impacted them. Each year we have had at least one student selected as a semi-finalist in the state of New Hampshire, and last year, we had our first New Hampshire state winner. Students often find creative writing contests to enter on their own as well, including some connected to books they have read. As writing does not take place only in ELA classes, there is a great deal of effort made among staff to incorporate writing in all subject areas, and there is frequent collaboration among teachers on various research projects and presentations.

Our philosophy of often allowing choice in reading enables us to offer more advanced students challenging works to read, and our less capable readers are able to find books at their level. Providing high interest literature encourages students to take risks and reach for more difficult books. Those students requiring extra support are also targeted for small group instruction based on their individual needs as revealed during testing and teacher observation. Our advanced students participate in unique programming open to high school students as well, and in the past this has included a girl's only book club, workshops with well known, successful writers and poets, and other artists in residence programming. In addition, these students have occasionally been able to take an advanced, online class.

#### 3. Mathematics:

The mathematics curriculum at Lisbon Regional Middle School is aligned with Common Core State Standards, and we used these standards to create our grade level competencies. These competencies consist of the skills we feel are essential for our students to learn. Our goal is that each child will be proficient at these competencies.

At the core of our program is an emphasis on problem solving and using knowledge to relate to real world experiences. Multiple methods are used to teach a given skill, and it is not uncommon to see a wide variety of instructional strategies being used during a single lesson. Students may be involved in math games, may receive whole group instruction, may work in small groups and with partners, and may work one-on-one with the teacher. It is not uncommon to hear students discussing how quickly class has passed.

Students can be seen using a variety of manipulatives to help them acquire skills. Students have access to: pattern blocks, algebra tiles, number lines, positive/negative chips, and graphing calculators. What is unique about our program is that students are shown multiple methods for solving problems and acquiring skills. Students are then encouraged through differentiation to choose one of the methods and develop it to proficiency and are assessed using multiple measures.

For students who are performing below grade level, we offer additional support in small group or one-on-one settings. Using the Response to Intervention (RTI) model, these supports are provided by Title One, Special Education teachers, and support staff. In addition to RTI, some students are required, while others have the option, of staying after school to get individual help from the math teachers. We also have a homework club staffed by a paraprofessional trained in math. To further help our students become proficient, students are allowed to make corrections on all formative assignments and are allowed another attempt on summative assessments.

For students who are performing above grade level, they are given enrichment activities to further apply these skills. Also, they have the opportunity to help other classmates attain a skill by being a "personal" tutor. Different assignments may be given to the students to further challenge them. Technology Student Association and Chess Club are offered as afterschool clubs to further enhance math skills.

### 4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Lisbon Regional Middle School is located in one of the least diverse regions of the United States. Having a very small minority population requires extra diligence in meeting our school's mission of having students appreciate the beauty and diversity of our changing world. Developing this appreciation and respect for diversity and a global awareness is a central component of our social studies curriculum.

Also essential to this curriculum is the creation of lessons that are challenging, appropriate for individual students, and of interest to them. To this end, a typical unit may include students collaborating on a lesson based on the tenants of differentiated instruction. Another lesson might find the class engaged in a variety of activities based on Howard Gardner's multiple intelligences.

The use of programs such as Channel One News, a nationally recognized news source for students, provides us with a link to the world. Through this source, we have spent a year following the "Arab Spring," and previously, the election of an African American President. Each year, students create and edit their own news programs. As part of our look at diversity, the minority experience is examined, and reading from various works produce valuable discussions among students.

In collaboration with other middle school teachers, a cycle of three multi-grade, cross curricular units has been developed, which extend our social studies' themes beyond the social studies classroom to transcend artificial separation of content areas and encourage the active involvement of all students. Students participate in a unit each year of their middle school experience. One unit involves the study of the contributions of the Renaissance to the world and culminates with a Renaissance Faire. The second unit focuses on cultures around the world. Students research a culture in teams and then compete in an "Amazing Race" style activity where they visit countries, complete tasks, and demonstrate their understanding of the cultures. The final unit revolves around the decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and has students examine our nation's advancements in technology, changes in our culture, and historical figures. The unit culminates with a celebration of the decades.

Whether it is learning about the free enterprise system by looking at our local economy, by collaborating to create and advertise ideas for a small business, or by creating a mock legislature with students writing bills to present to their classmates for consideration, all students are expected to participate, think, and be engaged. Most importantly, they learn by doing.

### 5. Instructional Methods:

In order for Lisbon Regional Middle School to accomplish our goal of having all students achieve academic success, a great deal of differentiating must be done to ensure that we meet the needs of our diverse learners. We differentiate within our classrooms in a variety of ways. For all learners, we design assignments, projects, and assessments around learning styles and multiple intelligences. Students are often given the choice in determining the activities they complete and how they will be assessed. For instance, students are often allowed to choose their own novels and then select from a range of project choices to demonstrate their knowledge.

Our technology resources allow us to support student learning through the use of such tools as SMART Boards. All middle school classes are held in classrooms with a SMART Board or have access to a portable SMART Board. This allows us to use tools that enable interactive learning. We have class sets of Senteo clickers that provide immediate feedback of student understanding. Our mathematics program contains software that utilizes the SMART Board. We also use several interactive games and simulations to encourage interest and reach students through a variety of modalities. Our ability to capture any document and use it in SMART Notebook Software allows us to display student work, worksheets, and model various skills such as note taking.

Using data from our school wide assessments such as NECAP and NWEA, we identify students who need additional supports and services. For these students, we provide interventions in mathematics and language arts. Interventions are in addition to their regular classes and are provided by our special education staff who work directly with the classroom teachers and various support staff. In addition to interventions, several of our students receive support in a small group setting to reinforce concepts and skills being addressed in class. Further assistance is offered after school through attending a homework club or working with individual teachers directly.

We have a wide assortment of technological equipment at our disposal. We have two mobile laptop labs exclusively for middle school use. To assist with reading instruction, we have several iPods, iPads, and Kindles. We also have books on tape, and the library has an extensive collection of high interest books at multiple reading levels. The library media center has also created a webpage which allows the school community access to powerful research databases. To assist with mathematics instruction, we have

student graphing calculators and a teacher graphing calculator on the SMART Board. A wide assortment of manipulatives is used as well. To support instruction in all areas, we have access to several video cameras, green screens, and a microscope that connects to the SMART Board. Additionally, we use several programs to stimulate student learning. Some of these are *Movie Maker*, wikis, blogs, *Voice Thread*, and *Prezis*.

### 6. Professional Development:

One of the primary goals of our professional development is to increase student achievement, and much of it is designed around school or district wide initiatives. Our school has moved away from staff development that consists of single day workshops or conferences and now focuses on long term, school wide, collaborative initiatives. One of the district wide initiatives that has been in place for several years is the subject/grade alike meetings that take place among the districts. Initially, these meetings were an avenue to develop common district curriculum within subject areas.

A few years ago, all schools in the district were asked to read about Differentiated Instruction. This led us to begin our work developing Competency Based Grading. We wanted a grading system that was consistent among all staff, was truly reflective of what students knew and were able to do, and reflected student mastery of skills. We used professional development days to work as a staff on developing this grading system, and are currently using professional development to refine our policies and implementation.

This collaborative approach was also how we addressed our K-8 literacy programs in response to Follow the Child, a New Hampshire state initiative implemented in an effort to increase student achievement. In addition to careful examination of our testing data, we began implementing the Response to Intervention (RTI) model. This required training for staff to understand RTI, and it also required training in developing and implementing effective interventions. Our literacy scores have increased substantially as a result of these efforts.

When looking at our testing data, writing is still one area where we need to continue to improve. As such, we have devoted a significant portion of our staff development to this end. We are currently participating in a program, funded by a grant, in which we are working with an expert in writing to determine how we can best differentiate our instruction to meet the needs of all our writers. Faculty members have been placed in professional learning communities and have weekly conversations with one another and the writing expert about how they are integrating writing into their classes. This is followed up by whole faculty workshops with the writing expert.

In addition to the writing, we are currently participating in subject specific programming designed to improve instruction. Our science department is working with a consultant to improve student achievement in science through differentiating instruction.

We are constantly striving to increase the achievement of all students, and our professional development programs reflect this.

### 7. School Leadership:

The leadership philosophy at our school is one of collaboration. Our principal is a true leader with a clear goal of keeping student achievement at the forefront of our staff development. He is forward thinking and keeps us abreast of current research in education. He has been instrumental in the establishment of several initiatives such as performance based graduation requirements, a steering committee which helps drive the direction of the school, and competency based grading.

Collaboration is evidenced by the number of teachers who take leadership roles within the school. While the principal is the visionary for work that is being done at Lisbon Regional Middle School, it is the teachers and other staff members who put the vision into a workable format. Work is done in committees with teachers from across disciplines working toward a common goal. Committees then present their work to the full staff where input from all staff is encouraged. Once an initiative is ready to implement, there is full support from the principal for staff development training and any other resources necessary to sustain the initiatives.

This leadership approach ensures that staff is invested in initiatives and that they continue regardless of changes in administration. For example, performance based graduation was an initiative our current leader spearheaded in 1993. It continues to this day even though there have been three changes in administration in the interim. This initiative required all grade levels in the building to increase opportunities for oral/visual presentations and to increase opportunities to develop research and writing skills. This led to our students being comfortable with public speaking and organizing and presenting their thoughts and information. These are skills invaluable in every aspect of their future.

Driven by the desire to increase student achievement is the current competency based grading system. As part of this, the students are assessed in a multitude of ways in order to demonstrate knowledge and skills. Students must be proficient at grade level competencies in order to receive credit. This has led to higher expectations for all students and consistency among staff. It is clear what is expected from students at every grade level and subject area.

As the examples illustrate, leadership is focused on student achievement at all times. The principal's leadership style involves the staff, supports the staff, and provides necessary resources to ensure success and sustainability of initiatives.

### PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

### STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Grade: 6 Test: NECAP Subject: Mathematics Edition/Publication Year: 2005 **Publisher: Measured Progress** 

|  | 2010-2011         | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | Oct               | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |                   |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 88                | 86        | 67        | 56        | 54        |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 40                | 25        | 19        | 9         | 16        |
| Number of students tested                  | 25                | 37        | 31        | 32        | 32        |
| Percent of total students tested           | 100               | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 0                 | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0                 | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |                   |           |           |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic | c Disadvantaged S | tudents   |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                   | 75        | 60        |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                   | 25        | 20        |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 7                 | 12        | 10        | 8         | 7         |
| 2. African American Students               |                   |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                   |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                   |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                   |           |           |           |           |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |                   |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                   |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                   |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                   |           |           |           |           |
| 4. Special Education Students              |                   |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                   |           |           |           | 18        |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                   |           |           |           | 0         |
| Number of students tested                  | 7                 | 3         | 4         | 4         | 11        |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |                   |           | <u> </u>  |           | <u> </u>  |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                   |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                   |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                   |           |           |           |           |
| 6.   |                   |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                   |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                   |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                   |           |           |           |           |
| NOTES:                                     |                   |           |           |           |           |

### NOTES:

There is only one student in the Level 1 "Substantially Below Proficient" category on the NECAP test for 2010 in Mathematics. We are extremely proud of this and it demonstrates our commitment to have all of our student succeed.

Subject: Reading Grade: 6 Test: NECAP Edition/Publication Year: 2005 Publisher: Measured Progress

|  | 2010-2011       | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | Oct             | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 88              | 92        | 84        | 62        | 63        |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 24              | 53        | 16        | 3         | 0         |
| Number of students tested                  | 25              | 36        | 31        | 32        | 32        |
| Percent of total students tested           | 100             | 97        | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic | Disadvantaged S | tudents   |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 | 92        | 70        |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 | 42        | 10        |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 7               | 12        | 10        | 4         | 7         |
| 2. African American Students               |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             | ·               |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 4. Special Education Students              | ·               |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           | 18        |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           | 0         |
| Number of students tested                  | 7               | 3         | 4         | 4         | 11        |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 6.   |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| NOTES:                                     | ·               |           |           |           | <u> </u>  |

We have moved all but one student out of the level 1 "Substantially Below Proficient" category in the sixth grade for 2010, something we are extremely proud. This demonstrates our commitment of success for all students.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 7 Test: NECAP Edition/Publication Year: 2005 Publisher: Measured Progress

|  | 2010-2011       | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | Oct             | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 77              | 65        | 71        | 61        | 50        |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 11              | 24        | 11        | 19        | 5         |
| Number of students tested                  | 35              | 34        | 35        | 31        | 38        |
| Percent of total students tested           | 100             | 100       | 100       | 100       | 97        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic | Disadvantaged S | tudents   |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 87              | 64        | 50        |           | 60        |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 7               | 21        | 8         |           | 10        |
| Number of students tested                  | 15              | 14        | 12        | 5         | 10        |
| 2. African American Students               |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 4. Special Education Students              |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 4               | 4         | 5         | 9         | 4         |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 6.   |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                 |           |           |           |           |

#### NOTES:

We only have one student in the Level 1 "Substantially Below Proficient" category on the State NECAP test in 2010 for Mathematics. We are extremely proud of this statistic and it demonstrates our commitment to "success for all".

Subject: Reading Grade: 7 Test: NECAP Edition/Publication Year: 2005 Publisher: Measered Progress

|  | 2010-2011       | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | Oct             | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 86              | 92        | 69        | 58        | 56        |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 23              | 21        | 6         | 6         | 3         |
| Number of students tested                  | 35              | 34        | 35        | 31        | 38        |
| Percent of total students tested           | 100             | 100       | 100       | 100       | 97        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic | Disadvantaged S | tudents   |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 73              | 79        | 50        |           | 70        |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 13              | 0         | 8         |           | 10        |
| Number of students tested                  | 15              | 14        | 12        | 5         | 10        |
| 2. African American Students               |                 |           |           | ·         |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 4. Special Education Students              |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 4               | 4         | 5         | 9         | 4         |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 6.   |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                 |           |           |           |           |

### NOTES:

We have "0" students in the Level 1 "Substantially Below Proficient" category of the 2010 NECAP test in Reading. This is a statistic that we are extremely proud and demonstrates our commitment to success for all.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 8 Test: NECAP Edition/Publication Year: 2005 Publisher: Measured Progress

|  | 2010-2011       | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | Oct             | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 71              | 66        | 74        | 66        | 44        |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 24              | 22        | 13        | 21        | 7         |
| Number of students tested                  | 34              | 32        | 31        | 29        | 30        |
| Percent of total students tested           | 100             | 100       | 100       | 100       | 94        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic | Disadvantaged S | tudents   |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 63              | 63        | 50        | 42        | 27        |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 19              | 18        | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Number of students tested                  | 16              | 11        | 12        | 12        | 11        |
| 2. African American Students               |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 4. Special Education Students              |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           | 10        |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           | 0         |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 4               | 3         | 10        | 4         | 4         |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 6.   |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| NOTES:                                     | ·               |           |           |           |           |

#### NOTES:

We only have three students at the Level 1 "Substantially Below Proficient" level on the 2010 NECAP State test. This is not where we want to be but not far off. Our goal is to have zero in this category.

Subject: Reading Grade: 8 Test: NECAP Edition/Publication Year: 2005 Publisher: Measured Progress

|  | 2010-2011       | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                                | Oct             | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                  | 91              | 88        | 67        | 62        | 60        |
| Proficient with Distinction                  | 35              | 22        | 6         | 7         | 7         |
| Number of students tested                    | 34              | 32        | 31        | 29        | 30        |
| Percent of total students tested             | 100             | 100       | 100       | 100       | 94        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed    | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed   | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                              |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic I | Disadvantaged S | tudents   |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                  | 88              | 73        | 42        | 42        | 45        |
| Proficient with Distinction                  | 44              | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Number of students tested                    | 16              | 11        | 11        | 12        | 11        |
| 2. African American Students                 |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                    |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students               |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                    |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 4. Special Education Students                |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                  |                 |           | 10        |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                  |                 |           | 0         |           |           |
| Number of students tested                    | 4               | 3         | 10        | 4         | 4         |
| 5. English Language Learner Students         |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                    |                 |           |           |           |           |
| 6.   |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Proficient with Distinction                  |                 |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                    |                 |           |           |           |           |

#### NOTES:

We have no students in the Level 1 "Substantially Below Proficient" category for Reading or Writing in the eighth grade on the 2010 State NECAP test. This demonstrates our efforts to help all students succeed at high levels.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: Weighted Average

|  | 2010-2011   | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-200 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Testing Month                              |             |             |           |           |          |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             |           |           |          |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 77          | 72          | 70        | 60        | 49       |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 23          | 23          | 14        | 16        | 9        |
| Number of students tested                  | 94          | 103         | 97        | 92        | 100      |
| Percent of total students tested           | 100         | 100         | 100       | 100       | 97       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             |           |           |          |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |          |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 76          | 67          | 52        | 40        | 35       |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 16          | 21          | 8         | 0         | 3        |
| Number of students tested                  | 38          | 37          | 34        | 25        | 28       |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             |           |           |          |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Number of students tested                  | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |          |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Number of students tested                  | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |          |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 73          | 29          | 21        | 5         | 15       |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 46          | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Number of students tested                  | 15          | 10          | 19        | 17        | 19       |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |             |           |           |          |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Number of students tested                  | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| 6.   |             |             |           |           |          |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Number of students tested                  | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |

Subject: Reading Grade: Weighted Average

|  | 2010-2011   | 2009-2010    | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-200 |
|--|-------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Testing Month                              |             |              |           |           |          |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |              |           |           |          |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 88          | 90           | 73        | 60        | 59       |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 27          | 32           | 9         | 5         | 3        |
| Number of students tested                  | 94          | 102          | 97        | 92        | 100      |
| Percent of total students tested           | 100         | 99           | 100       | 100       | 97       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 0           | 0            | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0           | 0            | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |              |           |           |          |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stud | dents     |           |          |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 81          | 81           | 53        | 38        | 56       |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 26          | 13           | 5         | 0         | 3        |
| Number of students tested                  | 38          | 37           | 33        | 21        | 28       |
| 2. African American Students               |             |              |           |           |          |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 0           | 0            | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 0           | 0            | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Number of students tested                  | 0           | 0            | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |              |           |           |          |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 0           | 0            | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 0           | 0            | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Number of students tested                  | 0           | 0            | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |              |           |           |          |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 66          | 59           | 31        | 5         | 15       |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 20          | 9            | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Number of students tested                  | 15          | 10           | 19        | 17        | 19       |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |              |           |           |          |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 0           | 0            | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 0           | 0            | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Number of students tested                  | 0           | 0            | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| 6.   |             |              |           |           |          |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 0           | 0            | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Proficient with Distinction                | 0           | 0            | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Number of students tested                  | 0           | 0            | 0         | 0         | 0        |